#### Before the

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Jurisdictional Separations Reform and	)	CC Docket No. 80-286
Referral to the Federal-State Joint Board	)	

#### **REPLY COMMENTS**

BellSouth Corporation and BellSouth Telecommunications Inc. ("BellSouth") reply to the various Comments filed on the State Members of the Federal-State Joint Board's ("State Members") *Glide Path Policy Paper*. <sup>1</sup>

## I. THERE IS NO COMPELLING REASON TO RETAIN SEPARATIONS FOR PRICE CAP CARRIERS.

Alaska Communications Systems, Inc. ("ACS") states correctly that "current jurisdictional separations rules were designed for a network that no longer exits," and "are an increasingly quaint reflection of the architecture and usage of a network of a bygone era." As ACS further demonstrates, jurisdictional separations is not a universal service mechanism, is not a substitute for interstate ratemaking, is difficult to apply to new technologies and services, and

<sup>&</sup>quot;Options for Separations: A Paper Prepared by the State Members of the Separations Joint Board," CC Docket No. 80-286 (filed Dec. 19, 2001) ("Glide Path Policy Paper").

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> ACS Comments at 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 2-4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Id. at 4-6.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 6-7.

creates arbitrage opportunities for new competitors.<sup>6</sup> Because jurisdictional separations have been and can continue to be gamed by regulators and competitors in order to achieve these aims, the Commission should seek to eliminate jurisdictional separations as an outdated regulatory mechanism.<sup>7</sup>

Small to mid-size rate of return local exchange carriers raise a number of issues unique to providing service in rural areas under rate-of-return regulation. BellSouth does not have issues in common with these carriers, even though BellSouth provides local exchange and exchange access services in a large number of rural, sparsely populated, high cost areas throughout the South. As a price cap carrier operating under price regulation in these states, BellSouth seeks the elimination of jurisdictional separations in order to assure that issues related to universal service funding, rate balancing, new services deployment and regulatory arbitrage can be addressed directly. The only interim approach that BellSouth supports is to maintain the current freeze, as advocated by Sprint and USTA, until separations can be done away with entirely.

To the extent that the Commission believes it should address issues specific to small to medium-size rate of return LECs, it should neither delay separations reform for price cap LECs nor modify the current freeze in a way that would be inconsistent with the ultimate goal of eliminating separations. Much as the Commission has dealt with access charge reform in

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 7-8.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> *Id.* at 9; BellSouth Comments at *passim*; SBC Comments at *passim*; Verizon Comments at 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Comments of Fred Williamson and Associates, Inc. at 3-5; Comments of the Western Alliance at 2-3; Comments of GVNW Consulting, Inc. at 2-3.

<sup>9</sup> Sprint Comments at 1-2; USTA Comments at 1-2.

separate proceedings involving larger LECs<sup>10</sup> and small to mid-size LECs,<sup>11</sup> it could eliminate jurisdictional separations for price cap carriers even as it considered transitional approaches for rate of return carriers. The proposals of the California Public Utilities Commission should only be considered, if at all, in the context of any transitional plan that may be proposed to apply only to rate-of-return LECs that have demonstrated the need for some sort of interim separations scheme beyond simply retaining the current freeze. The California proposals are inimical to either maintaining the current freeze or eliminating separations entirely, as illustrated by the disadvantages of these proposals that are identified in the *Glide Path Policy Paper*.<sup>12</sup>

#### II. CONCLUSION

The Commission should eliminate jurisdictional separations. If transition issues affect only one class of carriers, such as small-to-mid-size rate of return LECs, the Commission should not delay implementing separations reform with respect to price cap carriers as it considers those unique issues. No comments support re-regulatory Options 2 through 6 as outlined in the *Glide Path Policy Paper*, at least with respect to price cap carriers such as BellSouth. The comments confirm that the simplicity and predictability associated with the current freeze are indeed the appropriate "glide path" to the total elimination of jurisdictional separations.

In the Matter of Access Charge Reform, et al., CC Docket No. 96-262; Sixth Report and Order in CC Docket Nos. 96-262 and 94-1, Report and Order in CC Docket No. 99-249, Eleventh Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-45, 15 FCC Rcd 12962 (2000) ("CALLS Order").

In the Matter of Multi-Association Group (MAG) Plan for Regulation of Interstate Services of Non-Price Cap Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers and Interexchange Carriers, et al., CC Docket No. 00-256, Second Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 00-256, Fifteenth Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-45, and Report and Order in CC Docket Nos. 98-77 and 98-166, 16 FCC Rcd 19613 (2001) ("MAG Order").

Glide Path Policy Paper at 14-18.

### Respectfully submitted,

# BELLSOUTH CORPORATION BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.

By: /s/ Theodore R. Kingsley

Richard M. Sbaratta
Theodore R. Kingsley

Their Attorneys

Suite 4300 675 West Peachtree Street Atlanta, Georgia 30375-0001

(404) 335-0720 (404) 614-4054 (Facsimile)

Date: March 8, 2002

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I do hereby certify that I have this 8th day of March 2002 served the following parties to this action with a copy of the foregoing **REPLY COMMENTS** by electronic filing and/or by placing a true and correct copy of the same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the parties listed on the attached service list.

/s/ Juanita H. Lee
Juanita H. Lee

#### Service List CC Docket No. 80-286

Leonard A. Steinberg Alaska Communications Systems, Inc. 510 L Street, Suite 500 Anchorage, Alaska 99501

Gary M. Cohen
Lionel B. Wilson
Ellen S. Levine
People of the State of California
and The California Public
Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue

505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102

Robert Adkisson GVNW Consulting, Inc. 8050 SW Warm Springs Street Tualatin, Orgeon 97062

Emmanuel Staurulakis John Staurulakis, Inc. 6315 Seabrook Road Seabrook, MD 20706 Karen Brinkmann
Richard R. Cameron
Alaska Communications
Systems, Inc.
Latham & Watkins
Suite 1000
555 Eleventh Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20004-1304

Fred G. Williamson Fred Williamson and Associates, Inc. 2921 East 91<sup>st</sup> Street Suite 200 Tulsa, OK 74137

Keith Oliver Home Telephone Company, Inc. P. O. Box 1194 Moncks Corner, S. C. 29461

Richard A. Askoff National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc. 80 South Jefferson Road Whippany, New Jersey 07981 Margot Smiley Humphrey National Rural Telecom Association Holland & Knight 2099 Pennsylvania Avenue Suite 100 Washington, D.C. 20006

L. Marie Guillory National Telephone Cooperative Association 4121 Wilson Blvd Tenth Floor Arlington, VA 22203

Juanita Harris
Gary Phillips
Paul K. Mancini
SBC Communications Inc.
1401 I Street NW
11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005

Jay C. Keithley Rikke K. Davis Sprint Corporation 401 9<sup>th</sup> Street, NW Washington, DC 20004

Chris Barron TCA, Inc. – Telcom Consulting Associates 1465 Kelly Johnson Blvd Suite 200 Colorado Springs, CO 80920

Ann H. Rakestraw Verizon Telephone Companies Suite 500 1515 North Courthouse Road Arlington, VA 22201

Lawrence E. Sarjeant United States Telecom Association 1401 H Street, N. W. Suite 600 Washington, DC 20005

Gerard J. Duffy
The Western Alliance
Blooston, Mordkofsky, Dickens
Duffy & Prendegast
2120 L Street, N. W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037

+Magalie Roman Salas Office of the Secretary Federal Communications Commission The Portals, 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S. W. Room 5-B540 Washington, D.C. 20554 +Qualex International The Portals, 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W. Room CY-B402 Washington, D.C. 20554

Sheryl Todd Accounting Policy Division Federal Communications Commission The Portals, 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W. Room 5-B540 Washington, D. C. 20554

+ VIA ELECTRONIC FILING